



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

KB  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,054	07/16/2001	Chih-Ning Wu	NAUP0374USA	6941
27765	7590	01/02/2004		EXAMINER
NAIPO (NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE) P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			UMEZ ERONINI, LYNETTE T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/682,054	WU, CHIH-NING	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lynette T. Umez-Eronini	1765	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-7.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 9-13 and 15-19.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

In Claim 9 (Currently amended), "A wet cleaning proces comprising: and oxidation step --incorporated with-- a means for reducing Cu deposition on a cathode-like copper wiring line of a Cu-dual damascene structure, wherein the means for reducing Cu deposition on a cathode-like copper wiring line comprises a step of purging an inert gas during the oxidation process;" raises new issues that would require further consideration.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In Claim 9 (Currently amended), "A wet cleaning proces comprising: and oxidation step --incorporated with-- a means for reducing C deposition on a cathode-like copper wiring line of a Cu-dual damascene structure, wherein the means for reducing Cu deposition on a cathode-like copper wiring line comprises a step of purging an inert gas during the oxidation process;" still fails to overcome the 112(2) rejection in the last Office Action because: it is unclear whether an oxidation step includes reducing Cu depositon on a cathode-like copper wiring line of a Cu-dual damascene structure and

still fails to overcome the 112(1) rejection, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. "an oxidation step --incorporated with-- a means for reducing Cu deposition on a cathode-like copper wiring line of a Cu-dual damascene structure, wherein the means for reducing Cu deposition on a cathode-like copper wiring lines comprises a step of purging an inert gas during the oxidation process;--".



ROBERT KUNEMUND  
PRIMARY EXAMINER